

a booklet entitled "The Poultry Health Guide," which were shipped with the article, were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article would be effective to regulate the body functions of animals and to increase the flow of digestive juices; that it would be effective as a tonic, when used as directed; that it would produce the benefits implied by the phrase "Where hastened benefits are desirable"; that it would guard the animals against deficiency diseases due to all causes; and that it would increase profits as implied by the statement "Keep Their Insides Earning." The article would not be effective for such purposes.

Poultry Inhalant, misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the label and in the booklet entitled "The Poultry Health Guide," which was shipped with the article, were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article, when used as a spray over poultry, as directed on the label, would be effective for the relief of coughs due to colds and for the relief of minor bronchial irritations; that it would be effective as a treatment for respiratory diseases of poultry; that it would cause poultry to cough and expel the exudate; and that it possessed inhibiting antiseptic properties within the respiratory tract. The article would not be effective for the purposes claimed and did not possess any inhibiting antiseptic properties within the respiratory tract.

DISPOSITION: March 2, 1945. No claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the products were ordered destroyed.

1598. Misbranding of Wonder Poultry Tonic and Morehog. U. S. v. 64 Bottles and 6 Jugs of Wonder Poultry Tonic and 21 Bottles of Morehog, together with accompanying labeling. Default decree of forfeiture and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 12624. Sample Nos. 40115-F, 40116-F.)

LIBEL FILED: June 13, 1944, Western District of Wisconsin.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about April 10, 1944, by the Wonder Chemical Co., from Minneapolis, Minn.

PRODUCT: 42 1-quart bottles, 22 1-pint bottles, and 6 1-gallon jugs of *Wonder Poultry Tonic*, and 21 1-pint bottles of *Morehog*, together with accompanying labeling, at Ettrick, Wis. The labeling included a number of hand-out cards, placards, streamers, and posters.

Analyses of samples disclosed that the *Poultry Tonic* consisted essentially of water, with small proportions of epsom salt, sulfuric acid, iron sulfate, sodium phenolsulfonate, alum, and 0.1 percent of a volatile oil; and that the *Morehog* consisted essentially of water, with small proportions of iron sulfate, epsom salt, sulfuric acid, boric acid, iron oxide, and not more than 0.2 percent of volatile oils, including oil of wormseed.

NATURE OF CHARGE: *Poultry Tonic*, misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements in the labeling of the article were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article possessed significant therapeutic properties; that it was a tonic; that there was something wonderful about its composition; and that use of the article would prevent or cure disease conditions, thereby preventing losses in the raising of chicks. The article, when used as directed, had no value in the prevention and treatment of any disease condition affecting chicks and poultry.

Morehog, misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements in the labeling of the article were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article had medicinal value; that it would remove worms which infest hogs; that it was a tonic; that it was a conditioner; that it would cause hogs to gain more weight; that it was a stimulant to the appetite; and that it was beneficial to growing animals and those being fed for the market. The article had no medicinal value; it would not remove worms which infest hogs; it was not a tonic; it was not a conditioner, a term which implies that the article would improve the condition of hogs which were out of condition or off condition due to any number of causes, including disease; the article would not cause hogs to gain more weight, as the name "Morehog" and the statement in the labeling, "more hog gains," implied; it was not a stimulant to the appetite; and it consisted of nothing that was beneficial to growing animals and those being fed for the market.

DISPOSITION: September 21, 1944. No claimant having appeared, judgment of forfeiture was entered and the products, together with the accompanying labeling, were ordered destroyed.